

§ § §

REMARKS

§102(b) Rejection based on Salyer (US Patent 6,001,105) and Temeles (US Patent 6,283,971):

The Examiner for a fourth time rejects claims 1-12 under §102(b) as being anticipated by Salyer (US Patent No. 6,001,105). Applicant traverses this rejection as it is sincerely believed that the Examiner has misunderstood Applicant's claim language.

The Examiner states in his response to arguments that "the limitation of 'a cutting profile which substantially matches a profile of the overall shape to be cut' is inherent to any reamer, grater, drill, cutter, etc.". Applicant would agree with the Examiner if the claim were worded "the aggregate of the matched arc cutting edges" have "a cutting profile which substantially matches a profile of the overall shape to be cut" but this is not what the claim says. Instead, the claim requires that the "matched arc cutting edge" [clearly, of each tooth] has "a cutting profile which substantially matches a profile of the *overall* [or aggregate] shape to be cut". In the case of Salyer and Temeles, for example, the cutting edges are arcuate, and this arcuate shape *absolutely does not* match the profile of the *overall* [or aggregate] shape to be cut, as previously claimed. Again, one might argue that the aggregate of the cutting edges are positioned on the shell so as to roughly cut the overall or aggregate shape to be cut, but this is not what is claimed. Applicant claims that the tooth itself has a profile that matches the *overall or aggregate* profile to be cut.

It is believed that given the Applicant's clear language and the fact that at least one request for continued examination has already been filed in this case without substantial change in scope of the claims, that this case should be passed to allowance and not be subject to another filing of a request for continued application, together with the associated expenses. In an effort to better assure that this is possible, Applicant's

representative requests an interview with the Examiner to clarify any issues in this case that may remain.

§ § §


Conclusion

Applicant has made a diligent effort to advance the prosecution of this application by amending claims and pointing out herein with particularity how the claims now presented are patentably distinct from the prior art of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered by this amendment. Any limitations to the claims are made solely for the purpose of expediting the prosecution of the application and, unless otherwise expressly stated, are not made to narrow, vis-à-vis the prior art, the scope of protection which any subsequently issuing patent might afford. Again, if the Examiner has further questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at phone 011-4171-230-1000, fax at 011-4171-230-1001 (Switzerland is 6 hours ahead of Eastern Std Time), or e-mail at moetiteli@patentinfo.net.

The Undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fee or credit any overpayment of any fee under 37 CFR §1.16 and §1.17 which may be required in this application to the deposit account of MOETTELI & ASSOCIES SARL, no. 50-2621.

Respectfully submitted,

Date : June 28, 2007


John MOETTELI
U.S. Reg. No. 35,289

Enclosure: interview request form